

1 **CULHANE MEADOWS PLLC**  
2 13101 Preston Road, Ste. 110-1510  
3 Dallas, Texas 75240  
4 Millicent Meroney (State Bar No. 151304)  
5 Telephone: 512-585-0912  
mMeroney@cm.law  
6 Caroline Morgan (*Pro Hac Vice pending*)  
Telephone: 917-635-4940  
cmorgan@cm.law  
7 Jingjing Ye (*Pro Hac Vice pending*)  
Telephone: 469-410-5232  
jye@cm.law  
8 Lawrence Kass (*Pro Hac Vice to be filed*)  
Telephone: (914) 564-5694  
lkass@cm.law  
9 Attorneys for Defendants,  
LILY CHAO ET AL.

10

11 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**  
12 **NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**  
13 **SAN JOSE DIVISION**

14 ARIEL ABITTAN,

Case No.: 5:20-cv-09340-NC

15 PLAINTIFF,

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION**  
**FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

16 v.

Magistrate Judge:  
Nathanael M. Cousins

17 LILY CHAO ET AL.,

18 DEFENDANTS,

19 and

20 EIAN LABS INC.,

21 NOMINAL DEFENDANT.

22

23

24

25

26

27

28

**NOTICE OF MOTION AND MOTION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME**

**TO ALL PARTIES AND TO THEIR COUNSEL:**

**PLEASE TAKE NOTICE** that pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-1(b), Civil Local Rule 6-3, and Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 6(b), Defendants Lily Chao, Damien Ding, and Temujin Labs Inc. a Cayman Corporation (“Temujin Cayman”) (collectively “Defendants”), respectfully request the Court grant an extension to respond to the Complaint up and until October 29, 2021.

The instant motion is based on this Notice of Motion and Motion, and the below and the supporting Declaration of Millicent Meroney Lundburg.<sup>2</sup>

Respectfully submitted,

DATED: September 30, 2021

CULHANE MEADOWS PLLC  
Millicent S. Meroney

By: /s/ Millicent S. Meroney

1  
2 Defendants respectfully request the Court grant an extension to respond to the Complaint  
3 up and until October 29, 2021, and state as follows:

4 1. This motion meets the requirements of Local Rule 6-3, Motion to Change Time,  
5 which provides, in pertinent part, that such motion must include the following:  
6 (a) Form and Content. A motion to enlarge or shorten time may be no more than  
7 five pages in length and must be accompanied by a proposed order and by a  
8 declaration  
9 (1) Sets forth with particularity, the reasons for the requested enlargement or  
10 shortening of time;  
11 (2) Describes the efforts the party has made to obtain a stipulation to the  
12 time change;  
13 (3) Identifies the substantial harm or prejudice that would occur if the Court  
14 did not change the time; and ...  
15 (5) Discloses all previous time modifications in the case, whether by  
16 stipulation or Court order; and  
17 (6) Describes the effect the requested time modification would have on the  
18 schedule for the case.  
19 2. The record reflects that service has been a thoroughly litigated issue in this action.  
20 Indeed, this Court, in ruling on Defendants' motion to dismiss, Ordered Plaintiff to  
21 properly serve Defendants by September 20, 2021, failing which all Defendants  
22 shall be dismissed. Dkt. Entry 77.  
23 3. On September 13, 2021, and again on September 20, 2021, Plaintiffs filed  
24 certificates of service concerning alleged service on Defendants. Dkt. Entry 80-82.  
25 4. On September 27, 2021, Culhane Meadows PLLC ("Culhane Meadows") was  
26 engaged by Defendants to represent them in this matter. The recent engagement is  
27 one of the reasons for requesting this extension of time. Meroney Declaration in  
28 Support of Motion for Extension of Time ("Meroney Decl.") ¶ 1.

1           5. On September 28, 2021, during a meet and confer for a then upcoming case  
 2           management conference (the continuance of which this Court Ordered today,  
 3           September 30, 2021, Dkt. Entry 90), Plaintiff's counsel stated that it was their belief  
 4           that Temujin Cayman's time to respond to the Complaint had expired before  
 5           Culhane Meadows was retained. Plaintiff's counsel also stated that if Culhane  
 6           Meadows challenged service then Plaintiff would file a Rule 11 motion. Meroney  
 7           Decl. ¶ 2.

8           6. Culhane Meadows attempted several times to obtain Plaintiff's stipulation to this  
 9           continuance. On September 29, 2021, citing their recent engagement and counsel's  
 10           belief that Temujin Cayman was in default, Culhane Meadows asked Plaintiff's  
 11           counsel for thirty (30) days to respond to the Complaint. Meroney Decl. ¶ \_\_\_.  
 12           Plaintiff's counsel refused to grant Defendants the requested extension and instead  
 13           offered only two weeks of additional time *and on the condition that Defendants*  
 14           *waive service*, a central issue in this case, as explained above. *Id.* ¶ 3.

15           7. That same day, after denying Defendants' request for an extension of time, Plaintiff  
 16           sought as a professional courtesy an extension of time to respond to the complaint  
 17           in *Temujin Labs Inc. v. Ariel Abittan, et al.* 20 CV 372622 currently pending in the  
 18           Superior Court of the State of California, Santa Clara County, where the same  
 19           counsel represents Mr. Abittan as a defendant and Culhane Meadows represents  
 20           plaintiff Temujin Labs Inc. Defendants granted Plaintiff's request out of  
 21           professional courtesy *without any qualification* and made a second request for  
 22           Plaintiff to provide the same professional courtesy given him by Defendants and  
 23           grant their extension without any qualification in this action. Meroney Decl. ¶ 4.

24           8. On September 29, 2021, Plaintiff again declined to grant an extension to Defendants  
 25           unless Defendants waive service. Meroney Decl. ¶ 5.

26           9. Under California law, Defendants' request for a continuance due to a change in  
 27           counsel is reasonable and should be granted. Although the extension does not relate  
 28           to a trial date, a rule of the California Rules of Court involving trial continuances is

1 instructive. “Although continuances of trials are disfavored,” as the applicable Rule  
 2 states, the Rule goes on to specifically provide that a substitution of counsel required  
 3 in the interests of justice can constitute good cause for a continuance. Rule 3.1332(c)  
 4 (4). The simple fact that the Rules expressly list substitution of counsel as a potential  
 5 basis for continuing a *trial* highlights the reasonableness of granting a continuance  
 6 in such a case as this, where the burden should be low as the requested extension  
 7 does not involve trial and there would be no prejudicial disruption of the case  
 8 schedule. *Cf. Alvarado v. Fedex Corporation*, No. 04-0098 SI, at \*1 (N.D. Cal. June  
 9 2008) (“the Court finds that the substitution of counsel filed on June 9, 2008, and  
 10 the complexity of the matter justify an extension of time within which to file an [sic]  
 11 motion to modify the Special Master’s Recommendation”).

12 10. Given the significance of service in this action, an extension out of professional  
 13 courtesy is fair and reasonable when counsel has only been retained several days  
 14 ago and has not concluded whether service was proper or not, among other legal  
 15 issues.

16 11. Plaintiff had no problem making a similar argument when it argued to this Court in  
 17 connection with seeking an extension of time that, “[Plaintiff] is in the process of  
 18 obtaining substitute counsel, which substitute counsel, Plaintiff contends, will  
 19 require time to get up to speed on the matter[.]” Stipulation Setting Schedule and  
 20 Extending Time to Respond and Continuing Case Management Conference and  
 21 [Proposed] Order. Dkt. Entry 43.

22 12. Absent this Court granting the within Motion, the Defendants would be unduly  
 23 prejudiced and suffer substantial harm in that they either will face a default or be  
 24 prevented from considering and potentially asserting defenses they may have.  
 25 Meroney Decl. ¶ 6.

26 13. Defendants make this motion in good faith and not for undue delay. Meroney Decl.  
 27 ¶ 7.

28 14. A review of the docket and filings in this matter shows that prior to Culhane

1 Meadows being engaged, through stipulation, defendant Temujin Cayman's time to  
 2 respond to the Complaint has been extended four times. Defendants Lily Chao and  
 3 Damien Ding's time to respond to the Complaint has been extended by stipulation  
 4 once before. Meroney Decl. ¶ 8. Noteworthy, however, is this Court's Order after  
 5 all the aforementioned stipulations that service against all the Defendants with  
 6 respect to the Complaint was insufficient. Docket Entry 77. Since such Order, this  
 7 is the first request for an extension of time to respond to the Complaint that  
 8 Defendants have sought. Meroney Decl. ¶ 9.

9 15. The requested time modification would not impact the schedule for this case where  
 10 no party has filed an Answer and Plaintiff has a pending motion for alternative  
 11 service upon Defendants. Dkt Entry 83. Further the initial Case Management  
 12 Conference is not until November 17, 2021, which is after the proposed extended  
 13 time to respond to the Complaint. Meroney Decl. ¶ 11.

14 16. This motion meets all of the requirements necessary for the Court to grant it, include  
 15 the requirements of Local Rule 6-3, Motion to Change Time.

16 17. By making this motion, Defendants do not intend to appear in this action or waive  
 17 service and reserves all such rights related thereto.

18 Respectfully submitted,

19 DATED: September 30, 2021

20 CULHANE MEADOWS PLLC  
 21 Millicent S. Meroney

22 By: /s/ Millicent S. Meroney

23 \*\*\*\*\*

1 [PROPOSED ORDER]  
2

3 IT IS ORDERED THAT:

4 The above Request for Extension of Time is Granted so that Defendants will have up to and  
5 including October 29, 2021.

6 DATED:

7 \_\_\_\_\_  
8 Magistrate Judge:  
9 Nathanael M. Cousins  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28